REMARKS

Claims Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a) - Claims 1, 16, 20, 41, 43, 68, 83, 84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138

Claims 1-138 are pending in the present application and were rejected in the Office Action dated July 18, 2003, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable in view of Raven et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,429,361). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. However, in order to provide clarification only, claims 1, 16, 41-43, 68, 69, 83, 84, 100-102, 114, and 135-138 have been amended. The remainder of the claims are dependent claims and, as such, depend from their respective independent claims. For brevity, only the bases for the rejection of the independent claims are traversed in detail on the understanding that the dependent claims are also patentably distinct over the prior art, as they depend directly from their respective independent claims. Nevertheless, the dependent claims include additional features that, in combination with those of the independent claims, provide further, separate, and independent bases for patentability.

The Examiner states:

> Raven et al. discloses a gaming machine information, communication, and display system for automating maintenance, accounting, security, player tracking, event recording, player interaction, and other functions for a plurality of gaming machines. The system has display and data entry means for a player or employee to interact with the system. Furthermore, in addition to gaming functions, the system downloads data from the central data processor to each individual gaming machine.
> Paper 10, Pg. 2, Sec. 3.

Specifically, regarding claims 1, 16, 20, 41, 43, 68, 83, 84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, the Examiner admits that Raven et al. lacks the disclosure of "integrating the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display the gaming information." However, the Examiner states:

> Regarding Claims 1, 16, 20, 41, 43, 68, 83-84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention, integrating game play and service systems into a single interface display system were well

> known. It would have been obvious to integrate the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display the gaming information. Paper 7, Pp. 3-4.

Examiner's Response to Applicant's Previous Arguments – Paragraph 7

In paragraph 7 of the Office Action dated July 18, 2003, regarding claims 1, 16, 20, 41-43, 68, 69, 83, 84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, the Examiner bolsters his position that "integrating the systems interface into the gaming screen used to display gaming information" is well known in the art. In particular, the Examiner cites Walker et al. (U.S. 6.068,552) as showing a game screen display (210) which doubles as the game screen and the game customization screen, as shown in figures 3-6. The Examiner also cited several other patents in support of this position.

Applicants agree with the Examiner that Walker et al. (U.S. 6.068,552) shows a game screen display (210) which doubles as the game screen and the game customization screen. Applicants also agree that the other cited patents support the same position. However, this is not the statement that the Applicants were trying to exemplify in the language of the claimed invention. Specifically, the Applicants intended to refer to a systems interface for displaying non-gaming system information through a gaming platform. Walker et al. and the other references cited by the Examiner refer to gaming customization and other gaming related information. In this regard, the Applicants have amended claim 1 (and has corresponding amended the other independent claims) to recite "a systems interface incorporated into the display screen of the gaming platform, wherein the systems interface displays non-gaming system information from a system network through the gaming platform to a casino player or employee via the display screen of the gaming platform." (Emphasis on amended claim language).

Accessing gaming information (such as game customization parameters) on the display screen of the gaming device is not a difficult or profoundly unusual task, since this gaming information is already resident in the gaming machine. Indeed, accessing gaming information on the display screen of the gaming device is a very different and far simpler task, than accessing non-gaming system information from a system network through the gaming platform using the display screen of the gaming device, as is claimed in the claimed invention of the present application. Accordingly, Applicants have amended the claimed invention to clarify that the systems interface

accesses "non-gaming system information from a system network through the gaming platform via the display screen of the gaming platform" and is in this manner patentably distinct from the cited references that access gaming information that is already resident in a game device by using the display screen of that gaming device. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that these cited references do not support a 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-138, as amended.

Examiner's Response to Applicant's Previous Arguments – Paragraph 8

In paragraph 8 of the Office Action dated July 18, 2003, the Examiner states, regarding claims 1, 16, 20, 41-43, 68, 69, 83, 84, 100-102, 114, 118, and 135-138, that "Raven et al. (U.S. 5,429,361) clearly suggests to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to 'integrate the systems interface display system into the gaming screen used to display gaming information' simply because the user interface (12) is mounted directly next to the gaming display on gaming machine (10)." Respectfully, Applicants submit that the mere positioning of a system display interface near a gaming display interface in a gaming machine is insufficient evidence to produce a *prima facie* case of obviousness for an invention that claims a "systems interface [that] displays non-gaming system information from a system network through the gaming platform to a casino player or employee via the display screen of the gaming platform." (Emphasis on amended claim language).

A gaming system configured in accordance with the Raven patent is shown in Figure 2 of the present application. As is clearly shown, the Raven reference utilizes system components 60 (e.g., the 2 line VF display 60 and the 12 digit keypad 60) instead of a systems interface 20. Moreover, in the configuration disclosed in the Raven reference, the system components 60 connect to the system network 18 directly through the network interface 16.

In contrast, a gaming system configured in accordance with the claimed invention, which includes an integrated display and input system, is shown in Figure 1 of the present application. As is clearly shown, the systems interface 20 does NOT connect to the system network 18 directly through the network interface 16, but rather the system's interface 20 routes information through the gaming platform 70 via display screen 40 before connecting to the system network 18 through the

network interface 16. This is vastly different than simply combining two components mounted next to each other on a gaming machine.

Respectfully, producing a gaming system with a system interface that routes information through a gaming platform before connecting to a system network is a significantly more complex task (requiring added hardware and software connectivity) than simply connecting system components with a system network through a network interface. Advantageously, since the systems interface 20 routes information through the gaming platform 70 (via the display screen 40) in the claimed invention, the processor of the gaming platform can be utilized to produce an entirely new level of functionality.

Furthermore, the system's interface configuration of the claimed invention is a completely different system design than that disclosed in the Raven patent. Nothing in the Raven reference teaches or suggests the system's configuration of the claimed invention. Moreover, nothing in the Raven reference teaches or suggests that the claimed invention is a modernization of the Raven reference. Respectfully, the Examiner has cited no evidence to support the position that the claimed invention is a modernization of the Raven patent, other than the mere proximity of the user interface next to the gaming machine in the Raven patent. Absent some suggestion in the prior art to create a systems interface 20 that routes information through the gaming platform 70 (via the display screen 40), Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been made. Specifically, the Examiner has cited to no references that teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, a display and input system comprising: "systems interface displays non-gaming system information from a system network through the gaming platform to a casino player or employee via the display screen of the gaming platform" as claimed by the amended claims of the present application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-138 as unpatentable over Raven et al. has been overcome.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest and bona fide effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. In view of the foregoing discussions, it is clear that the differences between the claimed invention and the prior art are such that the claimed invention is patentably distinct over the prior art. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance of all of claims 1-138 is believed to be in order, and an early Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner should have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (310) 712-8319. The undersigned attorney can normally be reached Monday through Friday from about 9:30 AM to 6:30 PM Pacific time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11/18/03

BROOKE W. QUIST
Reg. No. 45,030
BROWN RAYSMAN MILLSTEIN FELDER
& STEINER LLP
1880 Century Park East, Suite 711
Los Angeles, California 90067
(310) 712-8300

BWQ:elm